

[Submitting Counsel on Signature Page]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: SOCIAL MEDIA ADOLESCENT
ADDICTION/PERSONAL INJURY
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION,

MDL No. 3047

Case No. 4:22-md-03047-YGR (PHK)

This Document Relates To:

ALL ACTIONS

**JOINT STATUS REPORT ON
DISCOVERY FOR JANUARY 25, 2024,
DISCOVERY MANAGEMENT
CONFERENCE**

Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

Magistrate Judge: Hon. Peter H. Kang

Pursuant to Discovery Management Order No. 1 (ECF No. 503), the Parties submit this Joint Status Report in advance of the January 25, 2024, Discovery Management Conference (“DMC”).

I. Status of Discovery

As of the filing of this statement, the Personal Injury and Local Government Entity and School District (“PI/SD”) Plaintiffs have served 175 requests for production (“RFPs”) on Meta, 197 RFPs on TikTok, 116 RFPs on Google and YouTube, and 121 RFPs on Snap. Of those, 108 requests are identical and were served on all Defendants, with responses and objections currently due in late February. The PI/SD Plaintiffs have categorized those requests into the following issues: organization and finance, features and warnings, health and safety, user demographics and targeting, marketing and lobbying, and student safety.

1 TikTok served written responses and objections to TikTok-specific “go get ’em” requests
 2 on January 8, 2024,¹ and will serve written response to jurisdictional requests directed at
 3 ByteDance Ltd. and TikTok Ltd. on February 10, 2024. Meta will serve written responses and
 4 objections to Meta-specific “go get ’em” requests on February 5, 2024.

5 As anticipated at the prior hearing, the Personal Injury Plaintiffs also propounded their
 6 Rule 30(b)(6) Notice of Deposition to Defendant Snap with respect to its deletion of certain user
 7 accounts. The deposition is scheduled to take place on January 31, 2024, as to certain of the
 8 topics, and on February 29, 2024, as to others.

9 **II. Proposed Discovery Plans**

10 Pursuant to Discovery Management Order No. 1, at 2 (ECF No. 503), the Parties submit
 11 their competing discovery plans and schedules for this Court’s consideration, attached hereto as
 12 **Exhibit A**. The Parties will be prepared to discuss at the DMC.

13 **III. Ripe Discovery Disputes**

14 **A. Protective Order**

15 As directed by this Court at the December DMC (*see* ECF No. 503, at 3), on December
 16 18, 2023, Plaintiffs resubmitted their objection to Paragraph 7.6 regarding the early disclosure of
 17 experts who receive Protected Material designated as “Highly Confidential.” *See* ECF No. 501
 18 (Motion to Modify Protective Order and related briefing); 502 (State Attorneys’ General Position
 19 Statement); 506 (Meta’s response to State Attorneys General). The Court previously heard
 20 argument on the issue at the December 14, 2023, DMC.

21 **B. ESI Order**

22 Following further meet and confers, as directed by this Court (ECF No. 503, at 4), the
 23 Parties submitted a joint chart outlining the Parties’ remaining disputes with respect to a proposed
 24 ESI Protocol. *See* ECF No. 534.1. The Parties will be prepared to discuss at the DMC.

27
 28 ¹ The PI/SD Plaintiffs and TikTok have begun meet and confer over TikTok’s responses and
 objections to Plaintiffs’ first set of RFPs and will submit unresolved disputes pursuant Section H
 of this Court’s Discovery Standing Order.

1 **IV. Ongoing Discovery Meet and Confers**

2 **A. RFPs and ESI Protocol**

3 **Parties' Position:**

4 As noted above, the PI/SD Plaintiffs have served their initial set of RFPs. They have
 5 already begun to meet and confer on TikTok's responses and objections to resolve disputes and
 6 expect to do so with the other Defendants once responses and objections are served. Relatedly,
 7 the Parties will be discussing Defendants' search methodologies to be used to respond to the
 8 RFPs, including identification of custodians, non-custodial data sources, and search terms, as
 9 appropriate. The Parties agree these will be iterative, ongoing discussions in response to
 10 Plaintiffs' discovery requests.

11 **Plaintiffs' Further Position:**

12 Other than the 108 common RFPs mentioned above, the PI/SD Plaintiffs' RFPs to date
 13 have largely been "go get 'em" requests for specific documents that do not require a search
 14 methodology, such as search terms. Defendants should be able to quickly locate the document
 15 and produced it. Production, moreover, should not be delayed (as it is already with TikTok)
 16 because this Court has not ruled on the narrow pending dispute regarding experts of the already-
 17 entered Protective Order (ECF No. 290) or the pending disputes in the ESI protocol, none of
 18 which prevent production of specific documents. Indeed, Meta, TikTok, and Snap have already
 19 made productions to Plaintiffs despite these pending disputes.

20 **Defendants' Further Position:**

21 As noted above, the PI/SD Plaintiffs have served a total of 609 RFPs on all Defendants,
 22 including 175 RFPs on Meta, 197 RFPs on TikTok, 116 RFPs on Google and YouTube, and 121
 23 RFPs on Snap. The PI/SD Plaintiffs' 108 common RFPs will require extensive search term and
 24 custodial negotiations, and many of the other supposed "go get 'em" requests that are Defendant-
 25 specific seek "all documents" and "all communications" related to various documents, which will
 26 also require extensive ESI negotiations and time before productions can be made. Defendants are
 27 in the process of preparing responses and objections to these requests and will be prepared to
 28 begin making initial productions (subject to those responses and objections) following entry of

1 the pending Protective Order and ESI Order.

2 **B. Personal Injury Plaintiff Fact Sheet and Related Orders and Forms**

3 On December 14, 2023, Judge Kuhl entered a Plaintiff Fact Sheet (“PFS”) and PFS
4 Implementation Order, along with a related “User Account Information Order” and associated
5 forms. The Parties anticipate soon seeking entry of these orders and forms in this proceeding,
6 conformed as appropriate.

7 **C. Local Government Entity and School District Plaintiff Fact Sheet and**
8 **Personal Injury Defendant Fact Sheet**

9 The PI/SD Plaintiffs and Defendants continue to meet and confer regarding (1) a PFS to
10 be used in the Local Government Entity and School District actions, and (2) a Defendant Fact
11 Sheet to be used in the Personal Injury actions, which will be submitted to Judge Kuhl in the
12 JCCP for resolution in the first instances. Once entered by Judge Kuhl, the PI/SD Plaintiffs and
13 Defendants intend to submit these orders (conformed as appropriate for the MDL) to the Court.

14 **D. Privilege Log**

15 On January 5, 2024, Plaintiffs sent to Defendants an initial draft of a privilege log
16 protocol. The Parties are in the process of meeting and conferring on the draft.

17 **E. Law Enforcement Sharing**

18 **States’ Position:**

19 The Personal Injury Plaintiffs and Defendants have been litigating various contested
20 provisions of the Protective Order since its entry in March 2023. *See, e.g. Dkt. No. 303*
21 *(Plaintiffs’ Motion for Relief from Nondispositive Pretrial Order of Magistrate Judge Regarding*
22 *Expert Disclosure; Dkt. No. 318 (Defendants’ Opposition to Same); Dkt. No. 321 (Plaintiffs’*
23 *Reply in Support of Same).* This briefing occurred before the State Plaintiffs entered this case.
24 The State Plaintiffs first raised the issue of law enforcement sharing with Defendants via email on
25 November 29, 2023. The State Plaintiffs then attempted to discuss this issue with Defendants
26 during a conferral call on November 30, 2023. At that time, Defendants declined to discuss the
27 issue and asked the State Plaintiffs to provide supporting authority for the law enforcement
28 sharing provision. In hopes that this issue could be resolved with Defendants and awaiting a

1 more fulsome substantive conferral, the State Plaintiffs did not raise this issue in the limited
 2 briefing addressing expert sharing provisions and ESI protocol submitted to the Court before its
 3 December Discovery Management conference. The State Plaintiffs renewed this issue by sending
 4 Defendants supporting authority on January 8, 2024, again requesting the opportunity to meet and
 5 confer on the issue. The State Plaintiffs received no response, so the State Plaintiffs again emailed
 6 the Defendants on January 10, 2024, about the law enforcement sharing provision. The
 7 Defendants indicated they were not available to meet until January 16, 2024. The parties then
 8 met and conferred on January 17, 2024. The State Plaintiffs also provided the parties with
 9 proposed language for a law enforcement sharing provision on January 17, 2024.

10 Up until January 18, 2024, Defendants advised the State Plaintiffs that the issue was not
 11 ripe. Only in the afternoon of January 19, 2024 did Defendants provide the State Plaintiffs with
 12 their position that the States Plaintiffs had waived the law enforcement sharing provision. The
 13 State Plaintiffs also dispute Defendants' description of the State Plaintiffs' proposed law
 14 enforcement sharing provision. In light of Defendants' position, the State Plaintiffs believe that
 15 legal arguments about this issue are best addressed in letter briefing. For those reasons, the State
 16 Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court set page limits and a briefing schedule on this issue.

17 **Defendants' Position:**

18 Notwithstanding that the State AGs have already submitted briefing to this Court on their
 19 protective order disputes, participated in oral argument on the protective order, and submitted
 20 post-argument supplemental briefing, they now seek to revisit the restriction on use of documents
 21 produced in this proceeding to permit them to unilaterally share those documents with any law
 22 enforcement officer anywhere in the world, without restriction. Plaintiffs had many opportunities
 23 to raise this issue with the Court, but waived their opportunity. Indeed, on December 13, 2024,
 24 the State AGs prepared a "Position Statement Regarding Protective Order" (Dkt. 478), which
 25 asked the Court to "remove the expert disclosure obligation imposed by Section 7.6," but did not
 26 seek any law enforcement sharing provision.² At the December 14 hearing before this Court, the

27 _____
 28 ² The State AGs had previously informed Defendants of the purported need for an expert
 disclosure provision. On November 30, Defendants requested the State's authority for such a
 provision. No such authority was provided until January 8.

1 State AGs then framed the question at the argument as “whether the protective order previously
 2 entered by Magistrate Judge Hixson should be modified.” Yet the only modification sought was
 3 to the expert disclosure provision. Following that hearing, on December 18, the State AGs filed
 4 their supplemental brief, which again did not seek the ability to share documents with law
 5 enforcement (Dkt. 502). By repeatedly failing to raise this issue at the appropriate time, the issue
 6 has been waived.

7 Even on the merits, their proposal should be rejected. The State AGs seek an expansive
 8 blanket law enforcement sharing provision that would permit them to unilaterally deliver
 9 Defendants’ confidential material to law enforcement agencies anywhere in the world for
 10 undefined “law enforcement purposes.” This is not a criminal case, and the State AGs have failed
 11 to explain how the unlimited transfer of Defendants’ documents (including potentially Defendants
 12 the State AGs have not named in their Complaint) to law enforcement entities across the globe
 13 would advance any legitimate local law enforcement need, much less the needs of this civil
 14 litigation. What’s more, during the parties’ recent conferral on this issue, the State AGs
 15 confirmed they would use this provision to share all Defendant discovery with the State AGs
 16 outside the MDL (including with the eleven State AGs that decided to sue Meta in state and
 17 federal courts across the country rather than joining the other State AGs in this MDL). The AGs’
 18 real goal is transparent: to obtain one-sided coordination that lets them share documents
 19 produced in the MDL with AGs suing Meta in state court, with no corresponding limits on the
 20 ability of the AGs suing in state court to seek even more discovery elsewhere (and presumably
 21 share that discovery with the AGs in the MDL). Any provisions governing discovery
 22 coordination should be addressed holistically, not through the guise of a protective order.

23 DATED: January 19, 2024

24 Respectfully submitted,

25 /s/ Lexi J. Hazam

26 LEXI J. HAZAM

27 **LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &
 BERNSTEIN, LLP**

28 275 BATTERY STREET, 29TH FLOOR
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3339

Telephone: 415-956-1000
lhazam@lchb.com

CHRISTOPHER A. SEEGER
SEEGER WEISS, LLP
55 CHALLENGER ROAD, 6TH FLOOR
RIDGEFIELD PARK, NJ 07660
Telephone: 973-639-9100
Facsimile: 973-679-8656
cseeger@seegerweiss.com

PREVIN WARREN
MOTLEY RICE LLC
401 9th Street NW Suite 630
Washington DC 20004
T: 202-386-9610
pwarren@motleyrice.com

Co-Lead Counsel

JENNIE LEE ANDERSON
ANDRUS ANDERSON, LLP
155 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
Telephone: 415-986-1400
jennie@andrusanderson.com

Liaison Counsel

JOSEPH G. VANZANDT
**BEASLEY ALLEN CROW METHVIN
PORTIS & MILES, P.C.**
234 COMMERCE STREET
MONTGOMERY, AL 36103
Telephone: 334-269-2343
joseph.vanzandt@beasleyallen.com

EMILY C. JEFFCOTT
MORGAN & MORGAN
220 W. GARDEN STREET, 9TH FLOOR
PENSACOLA, FL 32502
Telephone: 850-316-9100
ejeffcott@forthepeople.com

RON AUSTIN
RON AUSTIN LAW
400 Manhattan Blvd.

Harvey LA, 70058
Telephone: (504) 227-8100
raustin@ronaustinlaw.com

MATTHEW BERGMAN
GLENN DRAPER
SOCIAL MEDIA VICTIMS LAW CENTER
821 SECOND AVENUE, SUITE 2100
SEATTLE, WA 98104
Telephone: 206-741-4862
matt@socialmediavictims.org
glenn@socialmediavictims.org

JAMES J. BILSBORROW
WEITZ & LUXENBERG, PC
700 BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10003
Telephone: 212-558-5500
Facsimile: 212-344-5461
jbilsborrow@weitzlux.com

PAIGE BOLDT
WATTS GUERRA LLP
4 Dominion Drive, Bldg. 3, Suite 100
San Antonio, TX 78257
T: 210-448-0500
PBoldt@WattsGuerra.com

THOMAS P. CARTMELL
WAGSTAFF & CARTMELL LLP
4740 Grand Avenue, Suite 300
Kansas City, MO 64112
T: 816-701 1100
tcartmell@wcllp.com

JAYNE CONROY
SIMMONS HANLY CONROY, LLC
112 MADISON AVE, 7TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10016
Telephone: 917-882-5522
jconroy@simmonsfirm.com

CARRIE GOLDBERG
C.A. GOLDBERG, PLLC
16 Court St.
Brooklyn, NY 11241
T: (646) 666-8908
carrie@cagoldberglaw.com

1 KIRK GOZA
2 **GOZA & HONNOLD, LLC**
3 9500 Nall Avenue, Suite 400
4 Overland Park, KS 66207
5 T: 913-451-3433
6 kgoza@gohonlaw.com

7 SIN-TINY MARY LIU
8 **AYLSTOCK WITKIN KREIS &**
9 **OVERHOLTZ, PLLC**
10 17 EAST MAIN STREET, SUITE 200
11 PENSACOLA, FL 32502
12 Telephone: 510-698-9566
13 mliu@awkolaw.com

14 ANDRE MURA
15 **GIBBS LAW GROUP, LLP**
16 1111 BROADWAY, SUITE 2100
17 OAKLAND, CA 94607
18 Telephone: 510-350-9717
19 amm@classlawgroup.com

20 EMMIE PAULOS
21 **LEVIN PAPANTONIO RAFFERTY**
22 316 SOUTH BAYLEN STREET, SUITE 600
23 PENSACOLA, FL 32502
24 Telephone: 850-435-7107
25 epaulos@levinlaw.com

26 ROLAND TELLIS
27 DAVID FERNANDES
28 **BARON & BUDD, P.C.**
15910 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 1600
Encino, CA 91436
Telephone: (818) 839-2333
Facsimile: (818) 986-9698
rtellis@baronbudd.com
dfernandes@baronbudd.com

ALEXANDRA WALSH
WALSH LAW
1050 Connecticut Ave, NW, Suite 500
Washington D.C. 20036
T: 202-780-3014
awalsh@alexwalshlaw.com

MICHAEL M. WEINKOWITZ
LEVIN SEDRAN & BERMAN, LLP

1 510 WALNUT STREET
2 SUITE 500
3 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19106
4 Telephone: 215-592-1500
mweinkowitz@lfsbalw.com

5 DIANDRA "FU" DEBROSSE ZIMMERMANN
6 **DICELLO LEVITT**
7 505 20th St North
8 Suite 1500
9 Birmingham, Alabama 35203
10 Telephone: 205.855.5700
11 fu@dicellolevitt.com

12 ROBERT H. KLONOFF
13 **ROBERT KLONOFF, LLC**
14 2425 SW 76TH AVENUE
15 PORTLAND, OR 97225
16 Telephone: 503-702-0218
17 klonoff@usa.net

18 HILLARY NAPPI
19 **HACH & ROSE LLP**
20 112 Madison Avenue, 10th Floor
21 New York, New York 10016
22 Tel: 212.213.8311
23 hnappi@hrsclaw.com

24 ANTHONY K. BRUSTER
25 **BRUSTER PLLC**
26 680 N. Carroll Ave., Suite 110
27 Southlake, TX 76092
28 (817) 601-9564
akbruster@brusterpllc.com

FRANCOIS M. BLAUDEAU, MD JD FACHE
FCLM
**SOUTHERN INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL
AND LEGAL AFFAIRS**
2762 B M Montgomery Street, Suite 101
Homewood, Alabama 35209
T: 205.564.2741
francois@southernmedlaw.com

JAMES MARSH
MARSH LAW FIRM PLLC
31 HUDSON YARDS, 11TH FLOOR

NEW YORK, NY 10001-2170
Telephone: 212-372-3030
jamesmarsh@marshlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PHILIP J. WEISER

Attorney General
State of Colorado

/s/ Bianca E. Miyata

Bianca E. Miyata, CO Reg. No. 42012,
pro hac vice
Senior Assistant Attorney General
Lauren M. Dickey, CO Reg. No. 45773
First Assistant Attorney General
Megan Paris Rundlet, CO Reg. No. 27474
Senior Assistant Solicitor General
Elizabeth Orem, CO Reg. No. 58309
Assistant Attorney General
Colorado Department of Law
Ralph L. Carr Judicial Center
Consumer Protection Section
1300 Broadway, 7th Floor
Denver, CO 80203
Phone: (720) 508-6651
bianca.miyata@coag.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Colorado, ex rel.
Philip J. Weiser, Attorney General*

ROB BONTA

Attorney General State
of California

/s/ Bernard Eskandari

Nick A. Akers (CA SBN 211222)
Senior Assistant Attorney General
Bernard Eskandari (SBN 244395)
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
Megan O'Neill (CA SBN 343535)
Joshua Olszewski-Jubelirer
(CA SBN 336428)
Marissa Roy (CA SBN 318773)
Deputy Attorneys General
California Department of Justice
Office of the Attorney General
455 Golden Gate Ave., Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
Phone: (415) 510-4400
Fax: (415) 703-5480
Bernard.Eskandari@doj.ca.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff the People of the State of

1 *California*

2 **DANIEL J. CAMERON**

3 Attorney General Commonwealth
4 of Kentucky

5 /s/ J. Christian Lewis

6 J. Christian Lewis (KY Bar No. 87109),

7 *Pro hac vice*

8 Philip Heleringer (KY Bar No. 96748),

9 *Pro hac vice*

10 Gregory B. Ladd (KY Bar No. 95886),

11 *Pro hac vice*

12 Zachary Richards (KY Bar No. 99209),

13 *Pro hac vice*

14 Assistant Attorneys General

15 1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 200

16 Frankfort, KY 40601

17 CHRISTIAN.LEWIS@KY.GOV

18 PHILIP.HELERINGER@KY.GOV

19 GREG.LADD@KY.GOV

20 ZACH.RICHARDS@KY.GOV

21 Phone: (502) 696-5300

22 Fax: (502) 564-2698

23 *Attorneys for Plaintiff the*

24 *Commonwealth of Kentucky*

25 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

26 By: /s/ Phyllis A. Jones

27 Phyllis A. Jones, *pro hac vice*

28 Paul W. Schmidt, *pro hac vice*

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

One City Center

850 Tenth Street, NW

Washington, DC 20001-4956

Telephone: + 1 (202) 662-6000

Facsimile: + 1 (202) 662-6291

Email: pajones@cov.com

Attorney for Defendants Meta Platforms, Inc.

f/k/a Facebook, Inc.; Facebook Holdings,

LLC; Facebook Operations, LLC; Facebook

Payments, Inc.; Facebook Technologies, LLC;

Instagram, LLC; Siculus, Inc.; and Mark Elliot

Zuckerberg

FAEGRE DRINKER LLP

By: /s/ Andrea Roberts Pierson

Andrea Roberts Pierson, *pro hac vice*

Amy Fiterman, *pro hac vice*

FAEGRE DRINKER LLP

300 N. Meridian Street, Suite 2500

Indianapolis, IN 46204

Telephone: + 1 (317) 237-0300

Facsimile: + 1 (317) 237-1000

Email: andrea.pierson@faegredrinker.com

Email: amy.fiterman@faegredrinker.com

GEOFFREY DRAKE, *pro hac vice*

David Mattern, *pro hac vice*

KING & SPALDING LLP

1180 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 1600

Atlanta, GA 30309

Tel.: 404-572-4600

Email: gdrake@kslaw.com

Email: dmattern@kslaw.com

*Attorneys for Defendants TikTok Inc. and
ByteDance Inc.*

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSEN LLP

By: /s/ Jonathan H. Blavin

Jonathan H. Blavin, SBN 230269

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

560 Mission Street, 27th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94105-3089

Telephone: (415) 512-4000

Facsimile: (415) 512-4077

Email: jonathan.blavin@mto.com

Rose L. Ehler (SBN 29652)

Victoria A. Degtyareva (SBN 284199)

Laura M. Lopez, (SBN 313450)

Ariel T. Teshuva (SBN 324238)

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

350 South Grand Avenue, 50th Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90071-3426

Telephone: (213) 683-9100

Facsimile: (213) 687-3702

Email: rose.ehler@mto.com

Email: victoria.degtyareva@mto.com

Email: Ariel.Teshuva@mto.com

Lauren A. Bell (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
601 Massachusetts Ave., NW St.,
Suite 500 E
Washington, D.C. 20001-5369
Telephone: (202) 220-1100
Facsimile: (202) 220-2300
Email: lauren.bell@mto.com

Attorneys for Defendant Snap Inc.

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
Professional Corporation

By: /s/ Brian M. Willen

Brian M. Willen
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor
New York, New York 10019
Telephone: (212) 999-5800
Facsimile: (212) 999-5899
Email: bwillen@wsgr.com

Lauren Gallo White
Samantha A. Machock
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
One Market Plaza, Spear Tower, Suite 3300
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 947-2000
Facsimile: (415) 947-2099
Email: lwhite@wsgr.com
Email: smachock@wsgr.com

Christopher Chiou
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
633 West Fifth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2048
Telephone: (323) 210-2900
Facsimile: (866) 974-7329
Email: cchiou@wsgr.com

*Attorneys for Defendants YouTube, LLC,
Google LLC, and Alphabet Inc.*

WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP

By: /s/ Joseph G. Petrosinelli

Joseph G. Petrosinelli

jpetrosinelli@wc.com

Ashley W. Hardin

ahardin@wc.com

680 Maine Avenue, SW

Washington, DC 20024

Telephone.: 202-434-5000

Fax: 202-434-5029

*Attorneys for Defendants YouTube, LLC,
Google LLC, and Alphabet Inc.*

ATTESTATION

I, Lexi J. Hzam, hereby attest, pursuant to N.D. Cal. Civil L.R. 5-1, that the concurrence to the filing of this document has been obtained from each signatory hereto.

DATED: January 19, 2024

/s/ Lexi J. Hzam

LEXI J. HAZAM

**LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &
BERNSTEIN, LLP**

275 BATTERY STREET, 29TH FLOOR

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3339

Telephone: 415-956-1000

lhazam@lchb.com